



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,811	12/21/2001	Edgar Circenis	10016874-1	4048

7590 09/13/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

GELAGAY, SHEWAYE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2133

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/023,811	Applicant(s) CIRCENIS, EDGAR	
	Examiner Shewaye Gelagay	Art Unit 2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on June 23, 2005. Claims 8, 13 and 27 have been amended. Claims 1-32 are pending.

Specification

2. In view of the amendment filed June 23, 2005, the objection to the specification is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed June 20, 2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In response to the arguments concerning the previously rejected claims, the following comments are made:

The Applicant argues Weschler (U.S. Patent 6,842,903) does not disclose or suggest "any step related to determining if all required plug-in parameters for the at least one plug-in have been satisfied" and "filtering any required plug-in parameters from the one or more parameters specified with the computer operation." The Examiner disagrees. Weschler discloses plug-in modules like authorization and authentication module that are plugged in by specifying an initialization parameter. (Col. 8, lines 5-14; Col. 14, lines 1-14) Furthermore, Weschler teaches a mechanism to dynamically gain access to compatible plug-in features by determining a reference to the service and determining interface parameters for the service before running the plug-in module. (Col. 4, lines 30-33) The parameters are specified beforehand and are determined

Art Unit: 2133

before the plug-in is run, therefore, Weschler teaches determining and filtering required parameters.

The Applicant argues Kumazawa (U.S. Publication 2002/0016915) does not disclose or suggest "any step related to determining if all required plug-in parameters for the at least one plug-in have been satisfied" and "filtering any required plug-in parameters from the one or more parameters specified with the computer operation." Kumazawa discloses an authentication plug-in that extracts data or other data designated by the information user that is embedded as watermark in order to determine if a data and its linked content is authentic or not. Kumazawa discloses determining if the text locator matches with the watermark locator using the authentication plug-in. (Page 3, paragraphs 41 and 42; and Page 4, paragraph 43)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gullotta et al. (hereinafter Gullotta) United States Publication Number 2002/0147801 in view of Terretta United States Publication Number 2001/0047275.

As per claim 27:

Art Unit: 2133

Gullotta teaches a method for regulating execution of a computer operation by a computer operator comprising:

providing a programming interface for a customer to customize an authorization routine; (Page 6, paragraph 65)

receiving a request to execute a computer operation from a computer operator; (Page 6, paragraph 65)

determining if authorization is required for executing the computer operation; (Page 7, paragraph 78)

seeking authorization from an authorizing party with the authorization routine if authorization is required; (Page 7, paragraph 78)

executing the computer operation if authorization is granted; (Page 8, paragraph 91) and

terminating the computer operation if authorization is denied. (Page 8, paragraph 91)

In addition, Gullotta discloses authorization module for authenticating and authorizing each request from users before a request to an application server is executed. All requesters must be authenticated and authorized using password or certificate authentication before requests can be fulfilled. (Page 1, paragraph 14 ; Page 6, paragraph 73; Page 8, paragraphs 91, 93 and 97 ; Page 12, paragraph 140)

Gullotta does not explicitly disclose operating an authorization plug-in in a check mode, comprising determining if all required plug-in parameter are specified; and if all required plug-in are specified operating the authorization in an execute mode.

Art Unit: 2133

Trretta in analogous art, however discloses operating an authorization plug-in in a check mode, comprising determining if all required plug-in parameter are specified; (Page 2, paragraph 21, Page 4, paragraphs 38 and 40; *check mode is interpreted as checking if the parameters required for the given plug-in have been specified*) and if all required plug-in are specified operating the authorization in an execute mode. (Page 2, paragraph 21, Page 4, paragraphs 38 and 40; *execute mode is interpreted as authorizing; the interpretation is given based on the description given on the disclosure*)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Gullotta and Trretta to include operating an authorization plug-in in a check mode, comprising determining if all required plug-in parameter are specified; and if all required plug-in are specified operating the authorization in an execute mode. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Gullotta (Page 1, paragraph 14) for provisioning users based on policies that can take various process paths that are established as a result of the entry of users parameters.

As per claim 28

Gullota and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gullota further discloses a method comprising: determining if notification is required for executing the computer operation and if notification is required, providing a notification to the party to be notified, so that the party to be notified will know that the computer operation was executed. (Page 7, paragraph 78)

Art Unit: 2133

As per claim 29:

Gullota and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gullota further discloses a method wherein prior to executing the computer operation, authorization is sought from the same party as the party being notified, so that the authorizing party is the party being notified. (Page 7, paragraph 78)

As per claim 30:

Gullota and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gullota further discloses a method wherein seeking authorization further comprises asking the computer operator to enter a key and comparing the entered key with a key required by the authorizing party. (Page 6, paragraph 73; ...simple password authentication techniques or certificate authentication)

As per claim 31:

Gullota and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gullota further discloses a method comprising providing a toolkit for the customer to customize the authorization routine. (Page 9, paragraph 111)

6. Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weschler United States Letter Patent Number 6,842,903 in view of Kumazawa et al. (hereinafter Kumazawa) United States Publication Number 2002/0016915.

As per claim 1:

Weschler teaches a method for regulating execution of a computer operation, comprising:

Art Unit: 2133

reading one or more parameters specified with the computer operation; (Col. 4, lines 32-33)

determining if the computer operation requires a plug-in and if not, executing the computer operation; (Col. 4, lines 22-26; Col. 8, lines 5-7)

if the computer operation requires at least one plug-in, filtering any required plug-in parameters from the one or more parameters specified with the computer operation; (Col. 8, lines 7-9)

determining whether all required plug-in parameters for the at least one plug-in have been specified; (Col. 8, lines 11-14)

Weschler does not explicitly disclose terminating the at least one plug-in with failure if not all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; executing the at least one plug-in if all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; and executing the computer operation if the at least one plug-in terminates with success, wherein the at least one plug-in regulates execution of the computer operation.

Kumazawa in analogous art, however, discloses

terminating the at least one plug-in with failure if not all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; executing the at least one plug-in if all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; (Page 3, paragraph 41) and

executing the computer operation if the at least one plug-in terminates with success, wherein the at least one plug-in regulates execution of the computer operation. (Page 3, paragraph 42 and Page 4, paragraph 43)

Art Unit: 2133

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Weschler to include terminating the at least one plug-in with failure if not all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; executing the at least one plug-in if all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; and executing the computer operation if the at least one plug-in terminates with success, wherein the at least one plug-in regulates execution of the computer operation. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Kumazawa (Page 1, paragraph 13) in order to allow retrieving content from server only if the authentication process has confirmed the authenticity. This way, the plug-in parameters are checked against the stored data thereby allowing executing or terminating the plug-in.

As per claim 2:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a method wherein at least one plug-in requires at least one plug-in parameter. (Col. 4, lines 30-32)

As per claim 3:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a method comprising passing an error message to the computer operation indicating which of the required plug-in parameters have not been specified. (Page 3, paragraph 41; ...the processing unit causes the display unit to

Art Unit: 2133

display a warning message ...)

As per claim 6:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a method wherein the at least one plug-in further comprises an authorization plug-in and executing the at least one plug-in further comprises attempting to obtain authorization for executing the computer operation. (Col. 8, lines 21-24)

As per claim 7:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a method comprising terminating the authorization plug-in with failure if authorization was not successfully obtained, thereby terminating the computer operation. (Page 3, paragraph 41; ...the processing unit causes the display unit to display a warning message ...the processing unit ends the execution of the authentication plug-in)

As per claim 8:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a method wherein obtaining authorization further includes checking to see whether the value of at least one required plug-in parameter matches the value of at least one authorization parameter. (Page 3, paragraph 41)

As per claim 10:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a method wherein executing at least one plug-in

Art Unit: 2133

further comprises executing a notification plug-in. (Col. 13, line 38)

As per claim 11:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a method comprising determining whether all of the plug-in parameters required by the notification plug-in are specified before the computer operation and executing the notification plug-in after execution of the computer operation, whereby the computer operation is not executed if the notification plug-in terminates with failure after determining whether all of the plug-in parameters are specified. (Col. 14, lines 1-14)

As per claim 12:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a method wherein executing the notification plug-in further comprises notifying a party designated for notification. (Col. 14, lines 7-11)

7. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weschler United States Letter Patent Number 6,842,903 in view of Kumazawa et al. (hereinafter Kumazawa) United States Publication Number 2002/0016915 and further in view of Kobayashi et al. (hereinafter Kobayashi) United States Letter Patent Number 6,694,312.

As per claim 4:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Both references do not explicitly disclose a method further comprising passing a data

Art Unit: 2133

structure to the computer operation indicating which of the required plug-in parameters have not been specified.

Kobayashi in analogous art, however, disclose a method comprising passing a data structure to the computer operation indicating which of the required plug-in parameters have not been specified. (Col. 6, lines 56-58)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Weschler and Kumazawa to include passing a data structure to the computer operation indicating which of the required plug-in parameters have not been specified. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Kobayashi (Col. 6, lines 35-38) in order to permit the user to directly specify to control the execution of external functions.

As per claim 5:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Kobayashi teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kobayashi further discloses a method comprising prompting a user of the computer operation for the required plug-in parameters that had not been specified based on the data structure. (Col. 6, lines 48-53)

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weschler United States Letter Patent Number 6,842,903 in view of Kumazawa et al. (hereinafter Kumazawa) United States Publication Number 2002/0016915 and further in view of Edelman United States Letter Patent Number 6,857,067.

As per claim 9:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Both references do not explicitly disclose a method wherein the at least one authorization parameter is generated using a license key generating tool.

Edelman in analogous art, however, disclose a method wherein the at least one authorization parameter is generated using a license key generating tool. (Col. 8, lines 13-14; Col. 18, lines 64-67)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Weschler and Kumazawa to include at least one authorization parameter is generated using a license key generating tool. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Edelman (Col. 3, lines 62-63) in order to prevent unauthorized access. This way, the license data is verified before allowing the user to execute a plug-in.

9. Claims 13-20, 23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weschler United States Letter Patent Number 6,842,903 in view of Kumazawa et al. (hereinafter Kumazawa) United States Publication Number 2002/0016915 and in view of Terretta United States Publication Number 2001/0047275. As per claim 13:

Weschler teaches a computer operation for executing a system function on a computer further comprising:

a means for receiving at least one specified computer operation parameter; (Col. 4, lines 22-33; Col. 8, lines 5-9) and

Weschler does not explicitly disclose at least one plug-in that performs a regulatory function and that terminates with either success or failure, wherein the computer operation will execute only if the at least one plug-in terminates with success.

Kumazawa in analogous art, however, discloses at least one plug-in that performs a regulatory function and that terminates with either success or failure, wherein the computer operation will execute only if the at least one plug-in terminates with success. (Page 3, paragraphs 41 and 42 ; Page 4, paragraph 43)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Weschler to include at least one plug-in that performs a regulatory function and that terminates with either success or failure, wherein the computer operation will execute only if the at least one plug-in terminates with success. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Kumazawa (Page 1, paragraph 13) in order to allow retrieving content from server only if the authentication process has confirmed the authenticity of the user. This way, the plug-in parameters are checked against the stored data thereby allowing executing or terminating the plug-in.

In addition, Weschler discloses plug-in modules like authorization and authentication module that are plugged in by specifying an initialization parameter. (Col. 8, lines 7-14; Col. 14, lines 1-14) Kumazawa also discloses an authentication plug-in that extracts data or other data designated by the information user that is embedded as watermark in order to determine if a data and its linked content is authentic or not.

Art Unit: 2133

Kumazawa discloses determining if the text locator matches with the watermark locator using the authentication plug-in. (Page 3, paragraphs 41 and 42; and Page 4, paragraph 43)

Both references do not explicitly disclose means for operating the at least one plug-in a check mode; and means for operating the at least one plug-in in an execute mode.

Trretta in analogous art, however discloses means for operating the at least one plug-in a check mode; (Page 2, paragraph 21, Page 4, paragraphs 38 and 40; getting a user name or password from the user is interpreted as check mode; *the interpretation is given based on the description given on the disclosure*) and means for operating the at least one plug-in in an execute mode. (Page 2, paragraph 21, Page 4, paragraphs 38 and 40; verifying the password and authorizing is interpreted as execute mode; *the interpretation is given based on the description given on the disclosure*)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Weschler and Kumazawa to include means for operating the at least one plug-in a check mode; and means for operating the at least one plug-in in an execute mode. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to specify parameters for each of the plug-in service modules.

As per claim 14:

Art Unit: 2133

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein the computer operation determines which of the specified computer operator parameters is a plug-in parameter and passes all specified plug-in parameters to the at least one plug-in. (Col. 4, lines 30-32)

As per claim 15:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-in requires at least one required plug-in parameter. (Col. 8, lines 5-6)

As per claim 16:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-in determines whether any required plug-in parameters are among the specified plug-in parameters. (Col. 14, lines 1-4)

As per claim 17:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-in has a check mode in which the plug-in is executed to only check for the at least one required plug-in parameter. (Page 3, paragraph 41)

As per claim 18:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein the at least

Art Unit: 2133

one plug-in has an execute mode in which the execute mode causes the plug-in to perform the regulatory function of the plug-in. (Col. 8, lines 15-20)

As per claim 19:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a computer operation wherein the computer operation passes a mode flag to the at least one plug-in indicating whether to check for the at least one required plug-in parameter. (Page 3, paragraph 41)

As per claim 20:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-in generates at least one error message to be returned to the computer operation indicating that at least one required plug-in parameter was not specified.

(Page 3, paragraph 41)

As per claim 23:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein at least one plug-in is an authorization plug-in. (Col. 8, lines 21-24)

As per claim 25:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a computer operation where the authorization plug-in determines if authorization is granted by querying an authorization server to see if the computer is authorized to perform the computer operation. (Page 3,

Art Unit: 2133

paragraph 41)

As per claim 26:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein at least one plug-in is a notification plug-in and has means for notifying a party that the computer operation has been executed. (Col. 13, line 38)

10. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weschler United States Letter Patent Number 6,842,903 in view of Kumazawa et al. (hereinafter Kumazawa) United States Publication Number 2002/0016915 and in view of Terretta United States Publication Number 2001/0047275 and further in view of Kobayashi et al. (hereinafter Kobayashi) United States Letter Patent Number 6,694,312.

As per claim 21:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Neither of the references, however, explicitly disclose a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-in passes a data structure to the computer operation, whereby the data structure contains the plug-in parameters that were not specified.

Kobayashi in analogous art, however, disclose a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-in passes a data structure to the computer operation, whereby the data structure contains the plug-in parameters that were not specified. (Col. 6, lines 56-58)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Weschler,

Art Unit: 2133

Kumazawa and Trretta to include passing a data structure to the computer operation indicating which of the required plug-in parameters have not been specified. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Kobayashi (Col. 6, lines 35-38) in order to permit the user to directly specify to control the execution of external functions.

As per claim 22:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Neither of the references, however, explicitly disclose a computer operation wherein the computer operation prompts a user to enter at least one required parameter that was not specified.

Kobayashi in analogous art, however, disclose a computer operation a computer operation wherein the computer operation prompts a user to enter at least one required parameter that was not specified. (Col. 6, lines 48-53)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer operation disclosed by Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta to include a computer operation wherein the computer operation prompts a user to enter at least one required parameter that was not specified. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Kobayashi (Col. 6, lines 35-38) in order to permit the user to directly specify to control the execution of external functions.

Art Unit: 2133

11. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weschler United States Letter Patent Number 6,842,903 in view of Kumazawa et al. (hereinafter Kumazawa) United States Publication Number 2002/0016915 and in view of Terretta United States Publication Number 2001/0047275 and further in view of Edelman United States Letter Patent Number 6,857,067.

As per claim 24:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Neither of the references, however, explicitly disclose a computer operation where the authorization plug-in links to a license key generation tool controlled by an authorizing party so that the authorization plug-in grants authorization only if the system application is executed with a parameter specifying a license key generated by that tool.

Edelman in analogous art, however, disclose a computer operation where the authorization plug-in links to a license key generation tool controlled by an authorizing party so that the authorization plug-in grants authorization only if the system application is executed with a parameter specifying a license key generated by that tool. (Col. 8, lines 13-14; Col. 18, lines 64-67)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Weschler, Kumazawa and Trretta to include at least one authorization parameter is generated using a license key generating tool. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so,

Art Unit: 2133

as suggested by, Edelman (Col. 3, lines 62-63) in order to prevent unauthorized access.

This way, the license data is verified before allowing the user to execute a plug-in.

12. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gullotta et al. (hereinafter Gullotta) United States Publication Number 2002/0147801 in view of Terretta United States Publication Number 2001/0047275 and further in view of Grey et al. (hereinafter Grey) United States Publication Number 2002/0174023.

As per claim 32:

Gullotta and Terretta teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gullotta further disclose a method comprising determining if notification is required and if notification is required, checking to see if a party to be notified has been specified.

(Page 7, paragraph 78)

Both references do not explicitly disclose wherein failing to specify a party to be notified will cause the computer operation to terminate.

Grey in analogous art, however, discloses a method wherein providing data indicative of an authorization and performing authorization process to proceed after the notification is performed. (Page 6, paragraphs 49 and 50) By performing the notification before the authorization process, the vendor will be able to terminate the computer operation if unable to notify the proper authority.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Gullotta and Terretta to include failing to specify a party to be notified will cause the computer operation to terminate. This modification would have been obvious because a person

Art Unit: 2133

having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so as suggested by, Grey (Abstract) in order to have a system for conducting or facilitating a transaction or request involving a product. This way, proper authority is notified every time an authorization is requested to add additional service by an employee or an administrator.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2133

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shewaye Gelagay
8/26/05

SG


ALBERT DEORA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100